

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *

Criminal No. RDB-14-0186

v. *

RICHARD C. BYRD, *

*

Defendant.

* * * * *

ORDER

Presently pending before this Court is the *pro se* Motion of Mr. William C. Bond for this Court's reconsideration of its previous orders (ECF Nos. 170, 414, 521) denying the unsealing of various matters in this case. Mr. Bond's letter motion (ECF No. 550) was filed by this Court upon its email filing by Mr. Bond. Counsel for the Government and the Defendant Byrd have both indicated to the Court their opposition at this time to the unsealing of these matters.

The Court is mindful of the public's right of access to judicial proceedings. *Doe v. Public Citizen*, 749 F.3d 246, 265 (4th Cir. 2014). The Court has carefully considered all of Mr. Bond's many submissions and has weighed the competing interests in this matter. *See Stone v. Univ. of Md. Med. Sys. Corp.*, 855 F.2d 178, 181-82 (4th Cir. 1998); *see also Va. Dep't of State Police v. Wash. Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 576 (4th Cir. 2004). Having conducted this review, all portions of the record in this case which are currently under seal shall REMAIN SEALED.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THIS 21ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 2020, that Mr. Bond's Motion for Reconsideration of previous orders denying the unsealing of certain documents (ECF No. 550) is DENIED.

The Movant Bond is free to seek review of this Order by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, which has noted that “[m]andamus, not appeal, is the preferred method of review” for orders restricting access to criminal proceedings. *See Baltimore Sun Co. v. Goetz*, 886 F.2d 60, 63 (4th Cir. 1989) (internal quotation marks omitted).



Richard D. Bennett
United States District Judge